



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## GLEANINGS IN BIBLICAL CRITICISM.

## THE SONG OF THE PALANQUIN, &amp;c.

Judges v. 1. As Marquart and Ruben have pointed out, this verse and ver. 9 coincide; one of them is superfluous. But I do not think that either of them has given the best correction of the text. בפרע and פרעו (ver. 1) are duplicates. Read ברכו יהוה; ע and נ were confounded. Omit ברכו יהוה at the end of ver. 1 (a correction); ver. 1 b is simply המחנדים (as ver. 9 b). חב (the last letter of פרעות and the first of בישראל) is a fragment of חק[ק]. So in ver. 9 לבי ל is a mutilation of ברכו יהוה. Ruben's latest view of לבי (JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, April, 1899, p. 442) seems to me rather difficult. לב is not used as widely as Ar. *lubb*™. The Song therefore opens thus:—

“Bless Yahwè, ye governors of Israel,  
Who showed zeal among the people.”

Judges v. 6. Ruben (JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, April, 1893, p. 443) rightly adopts the βασιλεις of G<sup>A</sup>; but I can hardly see in מלכים the Aramaic מלכין “leaders (of caravans).” Read רבלים “merchants,” the same word which lies hidden in the troublesome חול of Deut. xxxiii. 19.

Cant. i. 13, צֶרֶר הַפֶּר | דּוֹדִי לִי בֵּין | שָׂדֵי יָלִין, R. V. “My beloved is unto me as a bundle of myrrh, that lieth between my breasts.” The phrase “a bundle of myrrh” is strange (see chap. v. 5, 13). The use of יָלִין in the sense of “lies constantly” is also remarkable. And the whole passage forms but an imperfect parallel to ver. 14, “My beloved is unto me as a cluster of henna-flowers in the vineyards of En-gedi.” Note also the Paseḵ after הַפֶּר. Grätz feels a part of the

difficulty. But it is not enough to read, with him, בִּין שָׁרִי, and he has to put dots instead of יִלִּין. The two most obviously doubtful words are הָמָר and יִלִּין. הָמָר in iv. 6 is miswritten for חֲרָמוֹן, and לְבוֹנָה for לְבָנוֹן. This suggests corrections for the two doubtful words referred to. Remembering many parallel corruptions elsewhere, I correct אֲרֹנִי אֲרָמוֹן דְּרֹדִי לִי בְּרֹשֵׁי לְבָנוֹן. Cf. iv. 11; v. 15.

Cant. iii. 6-11. Mr. Tyler's remarks in the JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, April, 1899, p. 515, suggest the communication of some fresh text-critical results. I have already denied the correctness of תְּלַפְיוֹת (iv. 4), which Budde is half inclined to regard as a Graecism, but which I suspect to have grown out of שְׁלֵטִים (*Expository Times*, IX, 423). I must now express an equally strong doubt as to the famous אֲפִרְיֹן (iii. 9), which almost all recent scholars admit to be a Greek loan-word = *φωφείον*, though Robertson Smith inclined to connect it with Sanskr. *paryāṅka* = palanquin. Assuming a late date, the use of such a loan-word is no doubt conceivable. But from the point of view of textual criticism and exegesis something still remains to be said. I do not think that after the words, "Behold, there is Solomon's *mittah*" (ver. 6), we expect to hear, "Solomon made himself an *appiryōn*;" *mittah* and *appiryōn* ought, it would seem, to change places, so that the foreign word would be explained by the native word. But is the text correct? It is remarkable that אֲפִרְיֹן and לְבָנוֹן should occur so close together. What if אֲפִרְיֹן should be a dittogram of לְבָנוֹן, ל and ב, ר and פ being confounded, and נ worn down into י? But how came לְבָנוֹן to be written at the *beginning* of the distich? The reason may be plausibly conjectured. For my own part—and I am sure that I do not stand alone—I have always been conscious of an instinctive surprise at the words מִפְּחַד בַּלֵּילוֹת, nor can even Siegfried's ingenious explanation ("for fear of night-goblins") dispel this feeling. מִפְּחַד בַּלֵּילוֹת "because of fear in the nights," should, as I think, be מִפְּחַד לְבָאוֹת "for fear of lions." This harmonizes well with the colouring of the poem. Next I venture to

suppose that, far back in the history of the text, the scribe miswrote בלילות, and then corrected this by writing לבאות. This latter word, under the hand of a thoughtless scribe, became לבנון, and this, by the ingenuity of an editor, who had both learning and exegetical skill, was converted into [א]פריון.

Thanks to Budde, it is now difficult not to see that the song in iii. 6-11 is written in the halting verse (Kîna metre). Plainly, however, some passages need pruning. If I differ in some respects from Budde, both in the distribution of the lines and in the readings, it is quite against my will; I would far sooner have been spared the trouble of revision, and greatly admire his insight. In ver. 7 I feel very strongly that Bickell is right in rejecting מְנַבְרִי and שְׁשִׁים; חֲנִיָּה, however, can quite well be retained. Budde's view that ver. 7 a α is a fragment of a full verse in Kîna metre is not probable. The verse which he suggests is not at all good; and שְׁשִׁים is as certainly a corruption of שְׁלֹמֹה as מְנַבְרִי יֵשׁ' is an amplification of גְּבִירִים in ver. 7 a β. In ver. 9 הַמֶּלֶךְ שְׁלֹמֹה is contrary to the usage of the poem apart from this song (on ver. 11 see below). Having eliminated אפריון, I am bound to hold that הַמֶּלֶךְ represents the object of the verb עָשָׂה. Read הַמְּלָאכָה, and all is plain (cf. מְלָאכָה בְּנֵחֶשֶׁת, 1 Kings vii. 14, and other passages cited in the lexicons for the sense of "work of art"). In ver. 10 a γ I read אֶלְגֻמִּים instead of אֶרְנָן. I cannot follow Hommel in his combination of the words for "purple" and for "almug-wood," but accidentally these words may easily have become confounded. How natural it is that a late poet should think of algum-trees in connexion with Solomon, it is unnecessary for me to point out. "Send me also cedar-trees, fir-trees, and algum-trees *out of Lebanon*," says Solomon in his letter to Hiram, king of Tyre, according to 2 Chron. ii. 8. מְרַבּוֹ אֶלְגֻמִּים should go with תּוֹכּוֹ, and אֶהְיָה should no doubt be הֶבְנִים "ebony" (Grätz, Siegfried). Budde hesitates to accept the latter correction, because "its seat, its centre is purple, inlaid with ebony," would be

a strained form of expression. No difficulty remains if the correction אֱלֹהִים be accepted. The closing reference to the "daughters of Jerusalem" is, of course, superfluous (see Budde), and שְׁלֵמָה should be deleted as a gloss.

The whole passage may be rendered thus:—

What is it that comes up from the wilderness | like pillars  
of smoke ;  
Perfumed with myrrh and frankincense, | with all spices of  
the merchant ?

See, it is Solomon's litter, | surrounded by warriors ;  
They are all wearers of swords, | expert in war.  
Every one has his sword on his thigh | for fear of lions.

Solomon made himself this artful work | of timber of  
Lebanon :  
Its pillars he made of silver, | its back of gold,  
Its seat—almug-wood in the centre, | inlaid with ebony.

Come forth, ye maidens of Zion, | and behold the king,  
In the crown with which his mother crowned him | on the  
day of his marriage,  
And in the day of the joy of his heart, | \* \* \*

Hos. iii. 4 ; iv. 5. Ruben (JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, April, 1899, p. 44 note) reads in iv. 5 וְדַמִּיתִי תַפְזִיר (M. T. אֶפְזִיר), excellent. This suggests a correction of iii. 4. For אֶפְזִיר וְתַרְפִּים read אֶפְזִיר וְתַפִּים. "Teraphim" just here has always been rather puzzling.

T. K. CHEYNE.